



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,816	01/25/2007	Sung-Hoon Kim	51876P1072	6972
7590	01/05/2011		EXAMINER	
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025				CHOKSHI, PINKAL R
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2425
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/05/2011 PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/577,816	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pinkal R. Chokshi	2425	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 18-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 18-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/14/2010</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/2010 with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See the new rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 18, 19, 21, 27, 28, and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 7,051,325 to Choi (hereafter referenced as Choi) in view of US PG Pub 2003/0219081 to Sheehan (hereafter referenced as Sheehan).

Regarding **claim 18**, “a method for receiving downloadable data in a data broadcast receiving apparatus” reads on the method for upgrading software in the receiving apparatus (abstract) disclosed by Choi and represented in Fig. 2.

As to “comprising the steps of: determining whether there is a downloadable data information descriptor in a broadcast stream which is received through a broadcast channel and includes the downloadable data” Choi discloses (col.2, line 55-col.3, line 48; col.3 lines 53-56) that the broadcast signal

that is transmitted to the receiving apparatus includes header that contains information for software code as represented in Fig. 1.

As to “extracting downloadable data identification from the downloadable data information descriptor” Choi discloses (col.3, lines 27-42) that the software code included in the stream is extracted from the stream as represented in Fig. 2.

As to “determining the kind of the downloadable data based on the extracted downloadable data identification” Choi discloses (col.4, lines 1-3, 53-57; col.5, lines 21-25) that the receiver determines from the extracted software code whether the entire software upgrade or the patch will be performed.

As to “upgrading predetermined data in the data broadcast receiving apparatus using the downloadable data according to the kind of the downloadable data” Choi discloses (col.3, lines 43-48; col.3, line 53-col.4, line 3) that the receiver upgrades the software by extracting the upgraded software data from the broadcast signal.

Choi meets all the limitations of the claim except “downloadable data information in a broadcast stream includes data identification.” However, Sheehan discloses (¶0049, ¶0053) that the broadcast signal transmitted to the receiver includes software upgrade data, where the receiver checks the data_type field to determine the type of data used in payload as represented in Fig. 7 (element 730). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi’s system by using data identification field in the downloadable data information as taught by

Sheehan in order to deliver correct software updates to set top boxes made my different manufacturers (¶0006).

Regarding **claim 19**, “the method as recited in claim 18, wherein the downloadable data information descriptor is transmitted through at least one among Program Specific Information (PSI) of the Moving Picture Experts Group (MPEG)-2 system, Data Service Table (DST) of the Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC) data broadcasting, Application Information Table (AIT) of the DVB-Multimedia Home Platform (MHP), and System Information (SI) of the Digital Multimedia Broadcasting (DMB)” combination of Choi and Sheehan teaches this limitation, where Choi discloses (col.5, lines 40-47) that the upgraded software data inserted in the broadcasting signal is transmitted using MPEG and DTV in the Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC) and Sheehan discloses (¶0030) that the ATSC has defined a structure for tables used in the PSI standard. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 18.

Regarding **claim 21**, “the method as recited in claim 18, wherein said upgrading predetermined data in the data broadcast receiving apparatus using the downloadable data includes the steps of: determining whether a version of the downloadable data is the same as a version of the predetermined data in the data broadcast receiving apparatus; and setting up the downloadable data if the

version of the downloadable data is not the same as the version of the predetermined data in the data broadcast receiving apparatus" Choi discloses (col.3, line 53-col.4, line 3) that the version comparing unit compares the version of the downloaded software data and version of a software data previously installed in the memory to determine a newer version and installs the upgraded software data.

Regarding **claim 27**, "a data broadcast receiving apparatus for receiving downloadable data" reads on the method for upgrading software in the receiving apparatus (abstract) disclosed by Choi and represented in Fig. 2.

As to "comprising: a demultiplexing component to demultiplex a broadcast stream which is received through a broadcast channel and includes the downloadable data" Choi discloses (col.2, line 55-col.3, line 48; col.3 lines 53-56) that the broadcast signal that is transmitted to the receiving apparatus includes header that contains information for software code as represented in Fig. 1. Choi also discloses (col.3, lines 27-42) that the software code included in the stream is extracted from the stream as represented in Fig. 2.

As to "a download processing component to determine whether there is a downloadable data information descriptor in the broadcast stream demultiplexed in the demultiplexing component and to determine the kind of the downloadable data based on downloadable data identification extracted from the downloadable data information descriptor" Choi discloses (col.2, line 55-col.3, line 48; col.3

lines 53-56) that the broadcast signal that is transmitted to the receiving apparatus includes header that contains information for software code as represented in Fig. 1. Choi further discloses (col.4, lines 1-3, 53-57; col.5, lines 21-25) that the receiver determines from the extracted software code whether the entire software upgrade or the patch will be performed.

As to “a processing component to upgrade predetermined data using the downloadable data according to the kind of the downloadable data determined in the download processing component” Choi discloses (col.3, lines 43-48; col.3, line 53-col.4, line 3) that the receiver upgrades the software by extracting the upgraded software data from the broadcast signal.

Choi meets all the limitations of the claim except “downloadable data information in a broadcast stream includes data identification.” However, Sheehan discloses (¶0049, ¶0053) that the broadcast signal transmitted to the receiver includes software upgrade data, where the receiver checks the data_type field to determine the type of data used in payload as represented in Fig. 7 (element 730). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi’s system by using data identification field in the downloadable data information as taught by Sheehan in order to deliver correct software updates to set top boxes made my different manufacturers (¶006).

Regarding **claim 28**, “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in

claim 27, wherein the downloadable data information descriptor is transmitted through at least one among Program Specific Information (PSI) of the Moving Picture Experts Group (MPEG)-2 system, Data Service Table (DST) of the Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC) data broadcasting, Application Information Table (AIT) of the DVB-Multimedia Home Platform (MHP), and System Information (SI) of the Digital Multimedia Broadcasting (DMB)” combination of Choi and Sheehan teaches this limitation, where Choi discloses (col.5, lines 40-47) that the upgraded software data inserted in the broadcasting signal is transmitted using MPEG and DTV in the Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC) and Sheehan discloses (¶0030) that the ATSC has defined a structure for tables used in the PSI standard. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 27.

Regarding **claim 30**, “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 27, wherein the processing component sets up the downloadable data if a version of the downloadable data is not the same as a version of the predetermined data” Choi discloses (col.3, line 53-col.4, line 3) that the version comparing unit compares the version of the downloaded software data and version of a software data previously installed in the memory to determine a newer version and installs the upgraded software data.

4. **Claims 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 32, 33, and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Sheehan as applied to claims 18 and 27 above, and further in view of US PG Pub 2004/0016002 to Handelman (hereafter referenced as Handelman).

Regarding **claim 20**, “the method as recited in claim 18, wherein the kind of the downloadable data includes a middleware module for accessing a mobile terminal and a middleware plug-in” Choi discloses (col.5, lines 21-25) that the receiver upgrades software in either patches (middleware plug-in) or to the whole system (middleware module).

Combination of Choi and Sheehan meets all the limitations of the claim except “middleware module for accessing a mobile terminal.” However, Handelman discloses (¶0044, ¶0091) that when the reconfiguration data is downloaded, it is used for the appliances such as cellular phone. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi and Sheehan’s systems by accessing a mobile terminal as taught by Handelman in order to upgrade consumer appliance to access different terminals connected to the appliances (¶0002).

Regarding **claim 23**, “the method as recited in claim 18, further comprising the steps of: checking whether the downloadable data includes a module capable of accessing a mobile terminal” Handelman discloses (¶0139) that once the

reconfiguration data is received, the device tested it to determine the correct operation of it.

As to “accessing the mobile terminal using the downloadable data if the downloadable data includes the module capable of accessing the mobile terminal” Handelman discloses (¶0083) that the modem in the STB is used to communicate with the Internet using telephone network as represented in Fig. 2 (element 140). Handelman further discloses (¶0044, ¶0091) that the STB, using its network connectivity, serves to multiple appliances, such as cellular phone, where when the circuit reconfiguration data is downloaded and installed in STB, it uses this data for the appliances. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 20.

Regarding **claim 24**, “the method as recited in claim 23, further comprising the step of: transmitting and receiving interactive data through a mobile communication network connected with the mobile terminal using the mobile terminal” Handelman discloses (¶0127, ¶0139, ¶0140) that the computer system appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB, where the reconfiguration data is received and installed, and using the reconfiguration data, its designed to support an OS of appliance, which is used to support various types of applications. Handelman further discloses (¶0127) that the appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB via the telephone network in order to use the reconfiguration data. Handelman further discloses (¶0099) that

the authentication procedure is performed by the user device. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 20.

Regarding **claim 26**, “the method as recited in claim 23, wherein said accessing the mobile terminal using the downloadable data includes the step of: executing user authentication using the downloadable data” Handelman discloses (¶0127, ¶0139, ¶0140) that the computer system appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB, where the reconfiguration data is received and installed, and using the reconfiguration data, its designed to support an OS of appliance, which is used to support various types of applications. Handelman further discloses (¶0127) that the appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB via the telephone network in order to use the reconfiguration data. Handelman further discloses (¶0099) that the authentication procedure is performed by the user device. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 20.

Regarding **claim 29**, “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 27, wherein the kind of the downloadable data includes a middleware module for accessing a mobile terminal and a middleware plug-in” Choi discloses (col.5, lines 21-25) that the receiver upgrades software in either patches (middleware plug-in) or to the whole system (middleware module).

Combination of Choi and Sheehan meets all the limitations of the claim except “middleware module for accessing a mobile terminal.” However, Handelman discloses (¶0044, ¶0091) that when the reconfiguration data is downloaded, it is used for the appliances such as cellular phone. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi and Sheehan’s systems by accessing a mobile terminal as taught by Handelman in order to upgrade consumer appliance to access different terminals connected to the appliances (¶0002).

Regarding **claim 32**, “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 27, further comprising: a mobile terminal accessing component to access a mobile terminal using the downloadable data if the downloadable data includes a module capable of accessing the mobile terminal” Handelman discloses (¶0083) that the modem in the STB is used to communicate with the Internet using telephone network as represented in Fig. 2 (element 140). Handelman further discloses (¶0044, ¶0091) that the STB, using its network connectivity, serves to multiple appliances, such as cellular phone, where when the circuit reconfiguration data is downloaded and installed in STB, it uses this data for the appliances. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 29.

Regarding **claim 33**, “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 32, wherein the mobile terminal accessing component transmits and

receives interactive data through a mobile communication network connected with the mobile terminal using the mobile terminal” Handelman discloses (¶0127, ¶0139, ¶0140) that the computer system appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB, where the reconfiguration data is received and installed, and using the reconfiguration data, its designed to support an OS of appliance, which is used to support various types of applications. Handelman further discloses (¶0127) that the appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB via the telephone network in order to use the reconfiguration data. Handelman further discloses (¶0099) that the authentication procedure is performed by the user device. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 29.

Regarding **claim 35**, “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 32, wherein the mobile terminal accessing component executes user authentication using the downloadable data” Handelman discloses (¶0127, ¶0139, ¶0140) that the computer system appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB, where the reconfiguration data is received and installed, and using the reconfiguration data, its designed to support an OS of appliance, which is used to support various types of applications. Handelman further discloses (¶0127) that the appliance communicates with the hardware device of STB via the telephone network in order to use the reconfiguration data. Handelman further discloses (¶0099) that the authentication procedure is

performed by the user device. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 29.

5. **Claims 22 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Sheehan and Handelman as applied to claims 20 and 29 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,078,951 to Pashupathy (hereafter referenced as Pashupathy).

Regarding **claim 22**, combination of Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman meets all the limitation of the claim except “the method as recited in claim 20, wherein said upgrading predetermined data in the data broadcast receiving apparatus using the downloadable data includes the steps of: checking whether a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) format of the downloadable data is registered if the kind of the downloadable data is the middleware plug-in.” However, Pashupathy discloses (col.1, lines 24-31; col.4, lines 28-30, 38-41) that the downloaded software program includes MIME format listed in table for STB is registered as represented in Figs. 3 and 4 (elements 320, 420).

As to “registering the MIME format of the downloadable data if the MIME format of the downloadable data is not registered; and setting up the downloadable data” Pashupathy discloses (col.4, lines 50-56) that given a MIME format, client device is updated each time a new program format is received and installed onto the client device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi, Sheehan,

and Handelman's inventions by using MIME format for downloaded data as taught by Pashupathy so the user does not have to search for the program that supports specific format by regularly updating the table (col.1, lines 36-37).

Regarding **claim 31**, combination of Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman meets all the limitation of the claim except "the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 29, wherein the processing component checks whether a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) format of the downloadable data is registered if the kind of the downloadable data is the middleware plug-in." However, Pashupathy discloses (col.1, lines 24-31; col.4, lines 28-30, 38-41) that the downloaded software program includes MIME format listed in table for STB is registered as represented in Figs. 3 and 4 (elements 320, 420).

As to "registers the MIME format of the downloadable data if the MIME format of the downloadable data is not registered, and sets up the downloadable data" Pashupathy discloses (col.4, lines 50-56) that given a MIME format, client device is updated each time a new program format is received and installed onto the client device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman's inventions by using MIME format for downloaded data as taught by Pashupathy so the user does not have to search for the program that supports specific format by regularly updating the table (col.1, lines 36-37).

6. **Claims 25 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Sheehan and Handelman as applied to claims 23 and 32 above, and further in view of US PG Pub 2004/0123332 to Hanson (hereafter referenced as Hanson).

Regarding **claim 25**, combination of Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman meets all the limitations of the claim except “the method as recited in claim 23, wherein said checking whether the downloadable data includes a module capable of accessing a mobile terminal checks whether the downloadable data includes a module capable of executing an access to the mobile terminal, the access to the mobile terminal being requested from a user.” However, Hanson discloses (¶0095) that the user at the remote terminal accesses the transmitted software program by a request for Internet access. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman’s systems by submitting a user request to for accessing mobile terminal as taught by Hanson in order to test and verify the upgraded software program.

Regarding **claim 34**, combination of Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman meets all the limitations of the claim except “the data broadcast receiving apparatus as recited in claim 32, wherein the mobile terminal accessing component accesses the mobile terminal after receiving a request for an access

to the mobile terminal from a user.” However, Hanson discloses (¶0095) that the user at the remote terminal accesses the transmitted software program by a request for Internet access. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Choi, Sheehan, and Handelman’s systems by submitting a user request to for accessing mobile terminal as taught by Hanson in order to test and verify the upgraded software program.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pinkal R. Chokshi whose telephone number is (571) 270-3317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian T. Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian T Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425

/Pinkal R. Chokshi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2425